

REMARKS

Claims 15, 19, 21-27 and 35-39 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 15, 19, 21-27 and 35-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker and Garland. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant's technique allows nodes of a network graph to be magnified when a mouse pointer points to a node or a predefined region. When applicant's technique detects such pointing by the mouse pointer, it determines whether the node is displayed with a scaling factor that is below a threshold. The threshold may be set to indicate the smallest scaling factor at which text of the node is comprehensible to a user. Thus, when the text of the node is not comprehensible, the node is magnified so that it is comprehensible.

The Examiner recognizes that Walker does not teach "determining whether node data is displayed with a scaling percentage that is below a threshold, when it is determined that the node data is displayed with a scaling percentage that is below the threshold, displaying one or more of the nodes at an increased magnification level relative to other nodes in the network diagram." (Office Action, July 24, 2007, p. 3.) To cure this deficiency, the Examiner points to Garland at Figure 6, 8:4-17, and 9:53-10:15.

Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in Garland, and in particular the relied-upon portion, teaches or suggests "determining whether a scaling percentage (or factor) is below a threshold" as recited by claims 15, 19, and 21-27. Garland describes a technique in which a menu entry such as 32H of Figure 3 is displayed in an enlarged font when a user moves a cursor near the menu entry. Figures 4A-4D illustrate the enlarging of a menu entry's font the user moves the cursor 43 close to the menu entry 44B. Garland does not immediately enlarge the menu entry to its final font size when a cursor is moved near the menu entry. Rather, Garland gradually enlarges the font until it reaches its final

size. Figure 6 is a graph that illustrates the size of the font over time. At time T0, the font is at its original size indicated by the intersection of the Linear plot and the zoom size axis. When Garland enlarges the size linearly, the Linear plot indicates the size of the font over time as it enlarges. At time L1, the font is at size S1. (Garland, 9:53-10:47.)

Garland neither teaches nor suggests a "scaling percentage" and determining whether that scaling percentage is "below a threshold." Garland simply gradually enlarges the font size from its original size to its final size and later reduces the font size from its final size to its original size. Garland has no scaling percentage. Applicant respectfully requests clarification as to what the Examiner believes in Garland corresponds to the claimed "scaling percentage."

Moreover, Garland always enlarges the font when the cursor is moved near the menu item. Garland thus does not base the "displaying [of] one or more of the nodes at an increased magnification level" or "enlarging the node" on a determination that a scaling percentage is below a threshold or scaling factor as recited by all the claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that Garland does not describe a scaling percentage and does not enlarge a font based on a scaling percentage being below a threshold.

Based upon the above remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268823US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 9-17-07

Respectfully submitted,

By Maurice J. Pirio
Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant